

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 15, 2008.

Claims 1, 10, and 17 are amended; claims 21 and 25-34 are cancelled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-20 and 22-24 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 9 lines 2-17, page 12 lines 19-20, and page 16 lines 14-19.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 17, 18, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong (U.S. 7,096,490) in view of Gabber (U.S. 5,961,593) and further in view of Selvarajan (U.S. 2002/032649). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection each and every claim limitation must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Selvarajan reference fails to teach or suggest a service that detects and denies multiple login events associated with temporarily assigned identity information. So, if someone can access a session or memory or decode the credentials associated with an alias identity in Selvarajan the alias identity can be compromised, such is not the case with Applicant's amended independent claim 1. Furthermore, none of the other references teach or suggest this limitation.

So, the rejections with respect to independent claim 1 should be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

With respect to independent claim 10, the Selvarajan reference fails to teach or suggest removal of a mapping associated with an identity configuration and a temporarily assigned identity information from cache when a request expires. This is another security hole that none of the references plug in that should memory be compromised the temporarily assigned identity information and its association to a true identity could be compromised as well. This is not the case with what Applicant has done and this fact is now illustrated with the amendments in claim 10.

Thus, the rejections with respect to independent claim 10 should be withdrawn and the Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

With respect to independent claim 17, none of the references show a combination of values being used for authentication of a request. In fact, the Gabber and Xiong references only address passwords standing alone. The Selvarajan reference does not provide for combinations to be used for authentication of a request by a service.

As such, the rejections with respect to independent claim 17 should be withdrawn and Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 3-9, 12-16, 19-24 and 27-34 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xiong in view of Gabber, in further view of Selvarajan and further in view of Gupta (U.S. 6,868,448). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; thus, for the amendments and remarks recited above with respect to the independent claims, the rejections of claims 3-9, 12-16, 19-24, and 27-34 should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action; however, this does **not** constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 08/15/08

By / 
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535